

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1, 3-4, 7-10, 13, 15-16, 19, 21-22, 25, 27, 28, 31, 33-34, 36, 37, and 39 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 7, 13, 19, 25, 31, 34, and 37 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 7, 13, 19, 25, 31, 34, and 37.

Claim Amendments

By way of this submission, claims 1, 3-4, 7-10, 13, 15-16, 19, 21-22, 25, 27, 28, 31, 33-34, 36, 37, and 39 are amended. Specifically, claims 1, 7, 13, 19, 25, 31, 34, and 37 are amended to address formality issues and clarify the invention. Applicant respectfully asserts no new matter has been introduced by way of these amendments, as support for these amendments may be found, for example, in the originally filed claims and in paragraphs [0007]-[0015] and [0039]-[0043] of the specification.

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 7, 13, 19, 25, 31, 34, and 37 are objected to because of formality issues in the form of grammatical errors. Claims 1, 7, 13, 19, 25, 31, 34, and 37 have been amended to address the issues raised by the Examiner. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner's objection be withdrawn in view of the amended claims.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 7, 19, 25, 31, 34, and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner is correct in stating that the “temporary user name” is used to obtain “the file,” as in a file storing “information resources,” i.e., data. Support for this statement may be found, for example, in paragraphs [0039]-[0043] of the specification. Claims 1, 7, 19, 25, 31, 34, and 37 are amended to reflect that the temporary user name is used to obtain a file and not a file dump. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

For unpatentability under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), a prima facie case of obviousness must be established. MPEP § 2143 states that “[t]he key to supporting any rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 is the clear articulation of the reason(s) why the claimed invention would have been obvious. The Supreme Court in KSR noted that the analysis supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 should be made explicit.” Further, when combining prior art elements, the Examiner “must articulate the following: (1) a finding that the prior art included each element claimed, although not necessarily in a single prior art reference, with the only difference between the claimed invention and the prior art being the lack of actual combination of the elements in a single prior art reference...” *See*, MPEP § 2143(A).

Claims 1, 7, 13, 19, 25, 31, 34, and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allison (“pwdump – Windows NT password hash retrieval”) (hereinafter

“Allison”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,592,553 (hereinafter “Guski”). To the extent that this rejection applies to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner’s contentions do not support rejection of amended claims 1, 7, 13, 19, 25, 31, 34, and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), for at least the reasons provided below.

Contrary to the Examiner’s contention, Allison fails to teach or suggest “decrypting the encrypted database password to obtain a database password, wherein the database password comprises a hash value derived from the user name and password.” Specifically, Allison only obtains a password database comprising encrypted passwords where the NT password protection has been removed. *See, e.g.*, Allison, pages 1, 2, 11. Under the description of the article, the author specifically states that de-obfuscating the NT Lanman and md4 hashes from the registry has many useful implications, “including allowing us to *hack the real password*.” *Id.* (emphasis added). The article also specifically states that the function of the code is to “[g]rab NT password hashes, which can then be cracked.” *Id.* The article further states that the Lanman and md4 hash can be written into the NT registry for a user account, wherein these account passwords can “be replicated and ‘brute forced’ into the NT password database.” *Id.* (emphasis added). At no point does Allison teach decrypting the encrypted database password to obtain a database password because it never obtains the fully decrypted password. Allison only teaches grabbing an NT password database, wherein the NT protection has been cracked by the code, but leaving the password database with its primary encryption still intact. *Id.* Because the fully decrypted password is never obtained, Allison

fails to teach or suggest decrypting the encrypted database password to obtain a database password, wherein the database password comprises a hash value derived from the user name and password.

Contrary to the Examiner's contention, Guski fails to teach or suggest "wherein access rights associated with the user name are greater than access rights associated with the temporary name" or supply that which Allison lacks. Specifically, Guski only describes a password evaluator being included with other software, specifically the IBM Resource Control Access Facility (hereinafter "RCAF"). *See, e.g.*, Guski, col. 6 ll. 42-56. When a user wishes to access a host application, a password generator generates a one-time password which is transmitted to an authenticating node. *See, e.g.*, Guski, col. 6 ll. 35-41. Using values transmitted to the authenticating node, a password evaluator then performs a time/date comparison to determine if the time between the password being generated and the transmission of the password to the authenticating node is within a reasonable timeframe. *See, e.g.*, Guski, col. 6 ll. 57-67, col. 7 ll. 1-3. However, Guski, in its reference to RCAF, only discusses the concept of including a password evaluator within a greater security application software. Guski does not describe functionality surrounding RCAF that would allow for a reasonable suggestion that RCAF limits application accessibility depending on whether a user is the user or a temporary user. Guski does not teach, by referencing RCAF, that access rights associated with a user name are greater than access rights associated with a temporary name. By only including a reference with no direct or indirect reference to varying degree of security levels for a user and a temporary user, Guski fails to teach or suggest wherein access rights associated with the user name are greater than access rights associated with the temporary name.

For at least the reasons provided above, the Examiner's contentions fail to support rejection of amended claims 1, 7, 13, 19, 25, 31, 34, and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 4, 15, 16, 21, 22, 27, 28, 33, 36, and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allison in view of Guski and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,418,854 (hereinafter "Kaufman"). To the extent that this rejection applies to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, amended claims 1, 7, 13, 19, 25, 31, 34, and 37 are patentable over Allison and Guski. Further, Kaufman does not supply what Allison and Guski lack because the Examiner only cites Kaufman to teach "wherein the database password is encrypted with a public key," "wherein the launcher application comprises a private key associated with the public key," and "wherein decrypting the encrypted database password is accomplished using a private key associated with the public key." *See* Office Action dated May 29, 2008, pp. 23-25. Thus, the Examiner's contentions fail to support a rejection of amended claims 1, 7, 13, 19, 25, 31, 34, and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for at least the reasons given above.

Accordingly, claims 3, 4, 15, 16, 21, 22, 27, 28, 33, 36, and 39, which depend, directly or indirectly, from amended independent claims 1, 7, 13, 19, 25, 31, 34, and 37 are therefore patentable over Allison, Guski, and Kaufman for at least the same reasons, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

New Claims

By way of this reply, claims 40-41 are newly added. Applicant respectfully asserts that no new matter has been added by way of this addition, as support for this addition may be found, for example, in paragraphs [0007]-[0015] and [0039]-[0043] of the specification. Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's contentions do not support a rejection of the new claims 40-41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and are allowable for at least the reasons provided above with respect to claim 19, to which claims 40-41 depend.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 37202/136001; 040098).

Dated: August 29, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By /Robert P. Lord/
Robert P. Lord
Registration No.: 46,479
OSHA · LIANG LLP
3945 Freedom Circle, Suite 300
Santa Clara, California 95054
(408) 727-0600
(408) 727-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant